

Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, the month of May.

As we celebrate the contributions and achievements of our community, I also want to pay special attention to the 250,000 Filipino World War II veterans President Roosevelt called into military service on July 26, 1941.

Of the 22,000 surviving Filipino veterans, I want to highlight Faustino "Peping" Baclig. Peping was one of the 75,000 Filipino and U.S. soldiers subjected to the 90-mile Bataan Death March. He survived the Japanese atrocities and fought side by side with the Americans only to have his service as a U.S. national and a veteran denied by the 1946 Rescission Act passed by Congress.

We now have a unique opportunity to undo the injustice of that act and give them recognition of a grateful Nation that their service to our country is just as equal as the soldiers with whom they stood shoulder to shoulder on the field of battle.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Filipino Veterans Equity Act.

ISRAEL'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartfelt congratulations to the State of Israel on the occasion of its 60th anniversary. Since its declaration of independence, Israel has stood as a strong ally and friend of the United States. This friendship stems from the commonalities that led to our respective foundings and our shared hopes for the future of the global community.

In forging a new nation, Israel established a home for people that were targeted for extermination and ostracism in other lands. From an arduous beginning, Israel's rise has come to mirror our own. Hailing from more than 100 countries on five continents, Israel's population exudes a diversity of culture and ideas. Israel has flourished through the development of a diverse and technologically advanced economy and has come to exemplify the best of what a democracy can be.

Our countries have stood by one another in peace and in war. And we will continue to stand together in fighting terrorism and threats from stateless actors and rogue nations.

I congratulate and celebrate with Israel and am proud to be part of the continued friendship between our countries.

THE FARM BILL

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I didn't plan to take any time today, but we will be debating the farm bill later today, and the rule that has come to

the floor does not allow anyone to claim time in opposition to the bill; so those of us who are opposed to this \$300 billion piece of legislation cannot even stand up and oppose the bill unless we get time, if they are generous enough to give it to us, from those who support the bill. Now, if I were wanting to hide what's in this bill, that's what I would do too.

This legislation allows multimillionaires to still collect farm subsidies. Under this legislation you can still make \$2.5 million as a couple in farm and nonfarm income and still collect subsidies. I would have a closed rule or a highly structured rule as well if I had this in a bill and wanted to hide it.

This bill needs to be rejected today. I hope we will all vote against the farm bill.

HONORING ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian Pacific Heritage Month in which our Nation pays a special tribute to the contributions of some 15 million of our fellow Americans who are of Asian Pacific descent, I want to honor in particular the thousands of our Asian Pacific Americans who serve in the Armed Forces of our Nation. In particular, Mr. Speaker, the sacrifices of some 10,000 nisei or Japanese American soldiers who fought for our Nation in the field of battle during World War II.

It was a time in our Nation's history when there was so much hatred, bigotry, and racism placed against Japanese Americans; yet despite all this, leaving their parents, their brothers and sisters, their wives behind barbed-wired fences in these concentration camps that were established, the White House accepted the request of over 10,000 Japanese Americans who volunteered to join the Army. As a result, two combat units were organized, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry Combat Group.

Mr. Speaker, the military records of the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry are without equal. A 314 percent casualty rate, receiving over 18,000 individual declarations, most of them posthumously: some 20 Congressional Medals of Honor, 33 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 9,480 Purple Hearts. That's quite a record, Mr. Speaker.

President Truman was so moved by their bravery in the field of battle as well as the contributions and the courage of the African American soldiers who fought during World War II that President Truman issued an executive order to finally desegregate all branches of the armed services.

MATERNAL MORTALITY

(Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enthusiastically support House Resolution 1022, a resolution recognizing maternal health as a basic human right of all women. How appropriate it is to stand here a week after Mother's Day in support of this commonsense initiative.

One in eight women in Afghanistan die due to complications resulting from pregnancy in childbirth. One in eight. And it's the same story in many countries around the world.

But, unfortunately, this is not just a Third World problem. Although the United States is a leader in medical technology and innovation, it has one of the worst rankings for maternal mortality in all the industrialized nations. We come in at a dismal 41st place, which means that a mother and her baby have a greater chance of survival in Kuwait or Croatia than they do in the United States.

In a relatively wealthy country, pregnancy should not be a death sentence. There are inexpensive and effective solutions that can significantly reduce the rates of maternal mortality, and I look forward to working with the Women's Caucus.

CELEBRATING BOTH MOTHER'S DAY AND ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I feel very fortunate today to be able to celebrate both Mother's Day as well as the Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

My mother-in-law was born on Molokai, has Filipino Hawaiian and Chinese ancestry and has 14 brothers and sisters spread from Hawaii to the Philippines. And she helped instill in my daughters the heritage and the values of family, hard work, and indomitable spirit. And I feel blessed to have those particular values from the Asian American community instilled in my children.

This is a great country. To have that kind of heritage and that kind of ancestry in my family now is what makes this country so great. So I get to celebrate Mother's Day and I get to celebrate Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

IN SUPPORT OF ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, and some of the things I

want to talk about are personal and some are of a public policy nature.

I never cease to admire the courage of my parents in bringing our family to this country, to a new country, a new language, a new culture. And interestingly enough, I have never been really able to say that to them in person across the kitchen table, and it's easier for me to say it right here on the House floor.

There are other lessons that are important, and one of them has been referred to earlier, the internment of the Japanese Americans during World War II. It is not an old, cold, dead issue. We passed the Military Commissions Act just before the 2006 elections. It substantially restricted habeas corpus for all Americans. And just as we apologize to Japanese Americans for the internment during World War II, someday we'll be apologizing for actions taken under the Military Commissions Act.

So some of the lessons learned from the Asian Pacific American experience are positive ones, and others are cautionary ones that we should continue to remember.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2419, FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1189

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report without intervening motion except (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1045

UNFUNDED MANDATE POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 1189 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the conference report which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the

point of order is predicated. Such a point of order shall be disposed of by the question of consideration.

The gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

After that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: "Will the House now consider the resolution?"

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order realizing that it is a bit of a stretch. The reason that we have this point of order in law is to guard against unfunded mandates being levied on the States. In this case, there are a lot of unfunded mandates being heaped upon taxpayers. I realize, as I said, this is a stretch. But I have to do this today because the rule that is before us does not allow anybody opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition to the bill.

Now how is it that a bill of this import, a bill that will spend over the next 10 years about \$300 billion, is not important enough to allow those who are opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition to it? Instead, the structured rule before us today allows time to be split between the majority and the minority. Now those who will be controlling that time are people who are in support of the bill. How is it that we can discuss a bill this large, this important, that spends this much money, and that heaps this kind of burden on the taxpayer, yet again, without having a real discussion?

When we have a bill before the House, we have time called "general debate." In this case, general debate is between those in the majority who support the bill and those in the minority who support the bill. Now how is that debate? Why is it that the Rules Committee can't see fit to actually allow people who are opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition to it?

With that, I would love to hear an explanation from the Rules Committee why we have a structured rule that does this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This point of order is about whether or not to consider the rule and ultimately the underlying conference report. In my opinion, it is simply an effort to try to kill this bill without any debate, without an up-or-down vote on the conference report itself. It is nothing more than procedural roadblocks, something the other side has been using a fair amount recently. I don't believe it will work.

The gentleman has talked about the fact that he is not able to speak in opposition. The gentleman had an hour's worth of debate the other day on a motion to recommit. It is also my understanding that the chairman is working with the opposition to allow them time

to discuss the bill within the rules that were set up.

This conference report is far too important, Mr. Speaker, to be blocked by a parliamentary tactic. We have worked on this bill for nearly 2 years and have accomplished what many of us thought was an impossible feat by bringing it to the floor.

Make no mistake about it. The Republican obstruction will ensure that a farm bill will not pass during this Congress. So despite whatever roadblocks the other side tries to use to stop this bill, we will stand up for America's hardworking farmers, for the hungry and for the millions of other Americans who will benefit from this farm bill.

We must consider this rule, and we must pass this important conference report without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding I have the right to close. But in the end, I will urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to consider this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Again, I realize this bill has been in discussion for a couple of years. And I will come to that a little later as we talk about why earmarks had to be airdropped into the bill at the last minute. If we have been discussing this bill for 2 years, then couldn't we actually discuss these earmarks that were to be added to the bill instead of airdropping them into the conference report when nobody in the House or nobody in the Senate had even seen them? So it is hardly a defense to say that we have been discussing this for 2 years, nor is it a reason to deny those who are opposed to the bill an opportunity to actually claim time in opposition.

Let me read from the House rules. If the floor manager for the majority and the floor manager for the minority both support the conference report or a motion, one-third of the time for debate thereon shall be allotted to a Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner who opposes the conference report or motion on demand of that Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner.

We waived that. And we are not doing it. And let me tell you why I think that is the case. Now if I were supporting this bill, and I had been touting this bill as some big reform to our farm programs, I would flat be plumb embarrassed to bring this bill to the floor in its current form. I would be embarrassed.

What has got most of the attention, the problem that we all note, that everybody across the country realizes, is how in the world can we have a situation where multimillionaire farmers are collecting subsidies courtesy of the taxpayer?

And the real effort in here, what the President wanted, what others wanted, and what many of us here in the House argued for, was to put a cap on how much income you can have and still receive subsidies. The President suggested \$200,000 adjusted gross income.